1 2

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10 11

13 14

12

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24 25

26

27

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

BRANDY OSTERHOUT,

٧.

Plaintiff,

MEDICAL STAFF AT FMWCC, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-01729-GMN-MDC

ORDER

Plaintiff Brandy Osterhout brings this civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 to redress constitutional violations that she claims she suffered while incarcerated at Florence McClure Women's Correctional Center. (ECF No. 1-1.) On September 23, 2024, this Court ordered Osterhout to file a fully complete application to proceed in forma pauperis or pay the full \$405 filing fee on or before November 20, 2024. (ECF No. 3). The Court warned Osterhout that the action could be dismissed if she failed to file a fully complete application to proceed in forma pauperis with all three documents or pay the full \$405 filing fee for a civil action by that deadline. (Id. at 2). In response, Osterhout filed a financial certificate, but she did not file an application to proceed in forma pauperis. (ECF No. 4).

In light of Osterhout's apparent attempt to comply with the Court's order, on December 4, 2024, the Court considered meaningful alternatives to dismissal and issued another order granting Osterhout one final opportunity to submit a complete application to proceed in forma pauperis on or before January 6, 2025. (ECF No. 5.) That extended deadline has past, and Osterhout still has not filed a complete application to proceed in forma pauperis. Nor did Osterhout request an extension or otherwise respond to the Court's order granting an extension.

## I. DISCUSSION

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and "[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal" of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based on a party's failure to obey a court order or comply with local rules. *See Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order). In determining whether to dismiss an action on one of these grounds, the Court must consider: (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the Court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives. *See In re Phenylpropanolamine Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Malone v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987)).

The first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of dismissal of Osterhout's claims. The third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal because a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. *See Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors favoring dismissal.

The fifth factor requires the Court to consider whether less drastic alternatives can be used to correct the party's failure that brought about the Court's need to consider dismissal. See Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier, 191 F.3d 983, 992 (9th Cir. 1999) (explaining that considering less drastic alternatives before the party has disobeyed a court order does not satisfy this factor); accord Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 643 & n.4 (9th

Cir. 2002) (explaining that "the persuasive force of" earlier Ninth Circuit cases that

"implicitly accepted pursuit of less drastic alternatives prior to disobedience of the court's

order as satisfying this element[,]" i.e., like the "initial granting of leave to amend coupled

with the warning of dismissal for failure to comply[,]" have been "eroded" by Yourish).

Courts "need not exhaust every sanction short of dismissal before finally dismissing a

case, but must explore possible and meaningful alternatives." Henderson v. Duncan, 779

F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986). Because this action cannot realistically proceed until

and unless Osterhout either files a fully complete application to proceed in forma pauperis

or pays the \$405 filing fee for a civil action, the only alternative is to enter a second order

setting another deadline. But the reality of repeating an ignored order is that it often only

delays the inevitable and squanders the Court's finite resources. The circumstances here

do not indicate that this case will be an exception: there is no hint that Osterhout needs

additional time or evidence that she did not receive the Court's order. Setting another

deadline is not a meaningful alternative given these circumstances. So the fifth factor

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

## II. CONCLUSION

favors dismissal.

Having thoroughly considered these dismissal factors, the Court finds that they weigh in favor of dismissal. It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on Osterhout's failure to file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full \$405 filing fee in compliance with this Court's September 23, 2024, and December 4, 2024, orders. The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment accordingly and close this case. No other documents may be filed in this now-closed case. If Osterhout wishes to pursue her claims, she must file a complaint in a new case.

DATED THIS 11 day of February 2025.

Gloria M. Navarro, Judge United States District Court